Copy to =
H. WEISBERG

HAL VERB
P.O. BOX 421815
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94142-1815

NOV. 8, 1995

EDITOR,
AMERICAN HERITAGE,
FORBES BUILDING,
60 FIFTH AVENUE,
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10011.

Dear Editor =

After reading Max Holland's article in the November, 1995 issue, "The Kennedy Assassination - Why the Warren Report Was Wrong - and Right" - I'm tempted to state = the business of the Warren Report is too important to be left to the historians.

I note that early in Holland's article he cites H.L. Mencken's reference to Americans "virulence of the national appetite for bogus revelation" but I think perhaps a more appropriate Menckenian citation, though with a slight paraphrase on my part, would be = "Let us trust in the historians who have fooled us so much in the past." (Mencken cited "God" in his one-liner instead of my "historians" but readers can well understand the intent).

I also note that Mr. Holland will be coming out with a "history" of the Warren Commission due out next year. In this context, it is interesting to note Mr. Holland's reference to the Warren Commission as a "national joke." But it is far worse than this for if Mr. Holland's book deals with the Warren Commission factually he will find that the Commission's deliberations and actions were a travesty - not a joke. Indeed, what it perpetrated on the American public was a national disgrace as its enduring legacy. This is no joking matter!

And what of the Warren Commission's inner workings? With all of the many witnesses who testified the unequivocal fact remains that in not a single instance were all seven Commission members present for a single witness. Not one! Another undisputed and enduring fact is that of the many expert marksmen asked by the commission to duplicate Oswald's alleged shooting ability not a single one was able to duplicate or re-create the crime!

In fact, one Warren Commission member, Senator Russell, who had grave reservations about two of the Commission "findings" (that of the so-called "magic (single) bullet" theory and the other being Oswald's intelligence links to the U.S. government), attended only six sessions where witnesses gave testimony. If Mr. Holland had read any of Harold Weisberg's books telling of how Russell was forced into accepting a compromised Commission decision while lied to about his role, Mr. Holland gives no hint of this. Weisberg had private conversations with Russell on this. And if Mr. Holland is unaware of this I suggest he read a recent article I wrote for "The Assassination Chronicles" (September, 1995) in which I provided further proof that the two "proofs" Russell was deeply skeptical of were covered up in a top secret non-public session. Too bad Senator Russell is not around to have read this article — Mr. Holland could've gotten him to comment on it & I believe Russell's comments would, in no way support any of the outlandish statements made by Holland in his article.

Although these contentions make out unanswering some of Mr. Holland's comments let me cite a few here which I also say are outlandish:

(1) "The essential integrity of its criminal investigation (is) unscathed."

(2) "The language of the single bullet was poorly drafted."

(3) "After more than thirty years the first conclusion (of the Warren Commission) — Oswald fired all the shots — remains proven beyond a reasonable doubt."

(4) (The assassination) was "first of all an act of opportunity by a bent personality."

(5) "a passing controversy over the President's autopsy that had been fairly easily resolved."

(6) (The Warren Commission offered) "a few embarrassing but not central truths."

Perhaps Mr. Holland can provide factual evidence or proof for all of these six assertions ~~but nowhere~~ in his upcoming book but nowhere in his article has he offered even a hint for any of these statements. Unless, of course, Mr. Holland is prepared to counter each of these assertions with the proviso (as he does in the title of the American Heritage article) that he is both wrong and right! If so - I eagerly await his book.

Yours truly,

Hal Verb